

AN

6983

ANSWER

TO

Mr. *SHEPHERD*'s

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

DEFENCE

OF THE

Discourse of Schism.

By *THO. BENNET*, M. A. Rector of
S^t James's in *Colchester*, and Fellow of *S^t John's*
College in *Cambridge*.

CAMBRIDGE:

Printed at the UNIVERSITY-PRESS, for *Edmund Jeffery*,
Bookseller in *Cambridge*, and *James Knapton* at the Crown
in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, LONDON, 1703.

Joseph's 2 sermons of separation.
His defence of the Discontent in America.
His Considerations on the Discontent.



ANSWER

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

DEFENCE

OF THE

Discourse of Schism

BY THO. BENNETT, M.A. Fellow of
St. James's in Cambridge, and
Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty.

CAMBRIDGE

Printed at the University Press, and Sold by
Messrs. Sturges, in Cambridge, and by
Messrs. Baskin, in London.

THE PREFACE.

TIS my great Misfortune to be engag'd with an Adversary, who is neither able nor willing, to make the Controversy depending between us, useful to the Reader.

Were not He my Neighbor, and had not Providence placed Me in a very great Town full of all sorts of Dissenters and Enthusiasts; I should have thought it unlawful for me to mis-employ the smallest portion of my Time in Answering such a Writer, as does neither understand the Matters he treats of, nor know when he is confuted.

But because many peculiar Circumstances oblige me to proceed in the discovery of his weakness, and other worse qualities; therefore Mr. Shepherd must not (as yet) reap the benefit of that Merciful Silence and Contempt, which I should otherwise have bestowed upon him.

March 24. 1702.

Tho. Bennet.

THE

THE
CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

THE Author's proof, that there were
several Congregations of Christians at
Corinth, when St. Paul wrote his first Epi-
stle to the Corinthians, Vindicated. Pag. 1

CHAP. II. That Mr. Shepherd has dropt
the main Controversy between himself and
the Author. 17

CHAP. III. The 14th Chapter of the De-
fence of the Discourse of Schism, Vin-
dicated. 28

CHAP. IV. Remarks upon several Passa-
ges of Mr. Shepherd's. 46

A N
A N S W E R

T O

MR. SHEPHERD'S Considerations, &c.

In a Letter to himself.

C H A P. I.

*The Author's proof, that there were several
Congregations of Christians at Corinth,
when St. Paul wrote his first Epistle to
the Corinthians, Vindicated.*

S I R,

I Have perus'd your *Considerations* on my *De-
fence* of the *Discourse of Schism*; and return
you the following Answer to them.

You have taken no notice of the first and second,
but begin with the third Chapter; in which I un-
dertook to prove, that there were several Congre-
gations of Christians at *Corinth*, when *St. Paul* wrote
his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*. This Assertion
I made good by shewing, 1. At what time *St. Paul*
wrote his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*. 2. What
Number of Christians there was at that time in *Co-
rinth*.

B

As

As to the first of these Particulars, I shewed that *St. Paul* writ his first Epistle to the *Corinthians* better than four years after his first Preaching of the Gospel there. Hereupon you tell me roundly, that I say, *St. Paul preached four or five years at Corinth*. Whereas I was so far from saying this, or any thing like it; that I had proved from Scripture, that *St. Paul* did not tarry at *Corinth* better than four years after his first Plantation of the Gospel there. Because after he had tarried at *Corinth* a year and half, he went to *Ephesus*, *Jerusalem*, &c. within that space of time. And from thence, one wou'd think, it shou'd plainly follow, that *St. Paul* did not, in my opinion, preach at *Corinth* those four or five years; unless you wou'd have me believe, that *St. Paul* might be at *Ephesus*, *Jerusalem*, &c. and yet preach at *Corinth* at the same time.

As to the second Particular, relating to the Number of Christians then at *Corinth*, I had (a) said, *Certainly there must have been many thousands*. But say (b) you, *if there were such Numbers of Christians then in Corinth, the Number of Converts in that place did far exceed, what was usual in other parts of the World*. Say you so, Sir? What then do you think of *Jerusalem*, in which three thousand were converted in one day, *Acts* 4. 41. and five thousand more believed, *Acts* 4. 4. These Converts do make up eight thousand persons. And yet besides these, we read of many other indefinite Numbers in the *Acts* of the Apostles. *The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved*, *Acts* 2. 47. *And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of Men and Women*, *Acts* 5. 14. And again, this Church was multiplied, *Acts* 9.

(a) *Def. chap. 3. p. 9.* (b) *Confid. p. 5.*

Mr. Shepherd's Considerations. 3

31. And the Word of God grew and multiplied, Acts 12. 24. There was, you see, a very great, as well as quick, increase of the Church of *Jerusalem*.

But farther, what saies St. *James* to St. *Paul*? *Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are, which believe, &c.* Acts 21. 20. In the Greek 'tis *μυριάς*, which signifies *tens of thousands*; and therefore that Text ought to be rendred thus, *Thou seest, brother, how many times ten thousand Jews there are, which believe, &c.* Now that I may be very reasonable, I will suppose, that those *many times ten thousand* were only four times ten thousand. And because some of them might be (in some mens opinion) Inhabitants, not of that City, but of the Parts adjacent; therefore I will also suppose, that only one half of those forty thousand *Jews* were Inhabitants of *Jerusalem*. Well then; there were twenty thousand believing *Jews* at *Jerusalem*, and God knows how many believing Gentiles; and all these put together made a vast body of Christians.

But farther still, *Eusebius* will (a) inform you, that before the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, which City was destroyed a few years after the Writing of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, the Unbelieving *Jews* were afraid, that the Whole City of *Jerusalem* wou'd become Christian; and that this fear led them on to the Murder of St. *James*. And after these plain and full Testimonies, I think I need add no other proofs of the Wonderful increase of the Church of *Jerusalem*.

I know, it may be objected, that the Christians of *Jerusalem* went to *Pella*, before the Destruction of their own City; and that *Pella* was not able to

(a) H.E. l. 2. c. 23. Edit. Vales.

receive so vast a number of people as I pretend those Christians were, together with its own Inhabitants. Now some call in question the truth of this story; but I shall not. Nor shall I dispute the bigness of *Pella*, and what shifts the Christians made there. 'Tis sufficient for me, that there is evident proof of the number I pretend; and that *Pella* could much better receive such a number of Christians, than *Kadesh*, which stood in a desert, *Numb.* 20. 1. could receive all the Children of *Israel*, *Numb.* 20. 16. It must be supposed therefore, that the Christians were in and about *Pella*; and this they might be, tho' their Number had been three times greater.

I have been particular in the instance of the Church of *Jerusalem*, because I shall have occasion for it afterwards. And were I not unwilling to be tedious in so plain a Case, I could prove from Scripture, that Vast Numbers were converted in other great Cities. I am sure *Eusebius*, who understood the true Numbers of the Primitive Christians much better than you or I, saies (a) expressly, that in the beginnings of Christianity the Gospel spread with such marvellous success, that Churches (*μνηστέριον*) of ten thousand Men a piece, and consisting of Vast Multitudes, were planted in all Cities and Villages. Now 'tis possible, that the Number *ten thousand* may be a definite for an indefinite number; but yet the exact and true Number must have been very great; and probably some Cities at least must have had full that Number of Christians in them. However, because I will still be reasonable, I will suppose, that *Eusebius* made the most of the matter; nay (tho' I think it almost an injury to *Euse-*

(a) *L. 2. c. 3.*

bis) I will be content to suppose, that he was considerably mistaken, and that there was no one City in the World besides *Jerusalem*, which had at that time above six thousand Christians in it.

This then being granted, that some Cities had six thousand Christians a piece in them; What shall we think of *Corinth*, which was a vastly great and populous City, and had the labors of *St. Paul*, *Apollos*, &c. to plant and cultivate the Gospel in it, with a special promise of peculiar success? Might not this City be well supposed to have had six thousand Christians in it, as well as any other? And yet I supposed only fifteen hundred therein, in my *Defence*; and tho' I think, I have now given you a demonstration of a much greater, yet I will still be content with the same Number. And I hope you will now no longer say, that *if there were fifteen hundred Christians then in Corinth, the Number of Converts in that place did far exceed what was usual in other parts of the World.*

But it seems, (a) you cannot suppose me so little conversant in, or unacquainted (I suppose you mean, acquainted) with *Antiquity*, as to be ignorant, that for above two hundred years after *Christ*, that vast City of *Rome* had no more Christians, than might meet together in one place for the exercise of Religious Worship. And the same may be said of *Alexandria*. And why we should look for larger Numbers of Converts in *Corinth*, than in either *Rome* or *Alexandria*, you can't imagin. I perceive, Sir, that notwithstanding some hasty words dropt in another place, you have a very great Opinion of my Skill in Church-History. You say, *You cannot suppose me ignorant, that for above two*

hundred years, &c. Why truly, if I did know this thing, which you cannot suppose me ignorant of; I am sure I should then know, what no-body knows besides my self. And this indeed is an extravagant Commendation of my Knowledge. But I shall distinctly consider each of these instances.

1. You say, that that Vast City of *Rome*, had no more Christians in it for above two hundred years after Christ, than might meet together in one place for the exercise of Religious Worship. Whereas whosoever has read *Tertullian's* Apology, cannot but know, that the City of *Rome* had so great a Number of Christians in it, within that Very time which you mention, as must of necessity make a very great Number of Distinct Congregations. For 'twas within that Very compass of time, that *Tertullian* lived and wrote his Apology to the *Roman* Governors; and I am sure, he tells you (a) therein, that the Number of Christians was then so great in *Rome*, that should the Christians leave it, *it wou'd be in a manner desolate, and as it were dead.* He saies also, that the Citizens of *Rome* were (b) *almost all of them Christians*; and that the Gentiles complained, (c) that the City was *over-run with Christians*, and that every

(a) Si enim tanta vis hominum in aliquem orbis remoti sinum abruptissemus a vobis, suffudisset utique dominationem vestram tot qualiumcunque amissio civium; immo etiam & ipsa destitutione punisset. Proculdubio expavissetis ad solitudinem vestram, ad silentium rerum, & stuporem quendam quasi mortuæ urbis; quæfissetis, quibus in ea imperassetis. *Tertul. Appl. c. 37. Ed. Pamel. Paris. 1616, p. 67.* (b) Nunc enim pauciores hostes habetis præ multitudine Christianorum pene omnium civium, pene omnes cives Christianos habendo. *ibid.* (c) Obsessam vociferantur civitatem; in agris, in castellis, in insulis Christianos; omnem sexum, ætatem, conditionem, dignitatem transgredi ad hoc nomen quasi detrimento morerent. *ibid. cap. 1. p. 22.*

sex, age, condition, and rank of men became Christians. Nay, he (a) assures the Roman Governors, that the Christians spent more Frankincense in a street for burying their dead, than the Gentiles spent in a Temple upon their Gods. In a word, he (b) saies in general, that they had filled the Roman Cities, Islands, Castles, Free Towns, Councils, Camps, &c. and had left them nothing to enjoy alone, but only their Idol-Temples. This and a great deal more Tertullian saies; and I appeal to your self, whether these Expressions concerning the Number of Christians in that Vast City of Rome, the Mistress of the World, do not plainly prove, that the Christians were so numerous in that City, that they could not possibly meet together in one place for the exercise of Religious Worship.

I know, you make use of the Authority of (c) Eusebius to countenance what you say: but Eusebius in that place which you quote, saies nothing like what you pretend. What he saies is this; that all the Brethren met to chuse a Bishop, and that Fabian was chosen by them all. And why may not all the Christians of Rome be said to meet, for the choice of a Bishop; tho' every individual person be not present in that Assembly: as well as all the People of London may be said in the same Sense to meet for the Choice of a Lord Mayor? I pray, did the Women meet upon that

(a) Scient Sabæi pluris & carioris suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profigari, quam diis fumigandis.——Plus nostra misericordia infumit viciatim, quam vestra religio templatim. *ibid.* cap. 42. p. 73. (b) Vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum. Sola vobis relinquimus templa. *ibid.* cap. 37. p. 67. (c) H. E. lib. 6. cap. 29.

occasion? And were not the Women Christians as well as the Men? But granting, that every individual Christian in *Rome* did then meet in one place upon that occasion; will it follow from thence, that there were no more of them at that Choice, than could meet together in one place for Religious Worship? Do you imagin, that all those persons who actually meet for the Choice of a Lord Mayor, could also meet together in one place for Religious Worship? Is there no difference in this respect between voting and praying? Or can as many persons hear a Sermon together in a Religious Assembly, as can meet together at an Election? But I am ashamed of such Arguments.

2. As for *Alexandria*, *Eusebius* (if you had read him, as you ought, and not contented your self with a mistaken Quotation, which you have probably borrow'd at second hand) would inform you, that the Evangelist *St. Mark* himself (*a*) planted (*ἐκκλησίαις*) Churches there; which proves, that there was more than one Congregation at *Alexandria* within the time you mention.

I could easily enlarge upon this Subject. *Tertullian* tells *Scapula*, that (*b*) almost the greater part of every City was in his time Christian. And what then shall we think of the Numbers of Christians at *Rome* and *Alexandria*? But I must remember what you have been pleased to (*c*) say, that *I am but of Yesterday*, and that *I have read little in Divinity, and digested less*. For this reason 'tis advisable for me to be very thrifty and sparing of my little Stock; and not waste any more quotations in the

(a) Lib. 2. cap. 16. (b) Pars pene major civitatis cujusque,
ad *Scap.* cap. 2. p. 130. (c) *Confid.* p. 81.

Discovery of your ignorance and mistakes. What I have said already, will convince any Man living, that you talk at random of what you do not at all understand; and this being proved, I have obtained my end.

I must now return to the Point, from which you have forced me to make a little Digression. There being therefore at least fifteen hundred Christians at Corinth, when St. Paul wrote his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*; the next question is, whether those fifteen hundred Christians did make one, or more than one, particular Church or Congregation. Now (said (a) I) you know, Sir, how very few Churches there are in this whole Kingdom, tho' Christianity is the Religion of the Country, and settled by Law amongst us; you know, I say, how very few Churches there are in England capable of so great a Number of People. And there are still fewer, that can contain fifteen hundred so conveniently, as that all may join in God's Public Service. And therefore 'tis ridiculous to imagine, that the Christians at Corinth had, in so short a time, and in the midst of a Heathen Country, so large an Edifice for Public Worship, as would receive their whole Number. And consequently, there must then be at Corinth diverse distinct Churches or Congregations of Christians.

But say (b) you, they did not need public places built for Worship in that infant Age of Christianity. For where did St. Peter preach, when he converted three thousand Souls by one Sermon? He had, you will confess, no public place for Worship, any more than these *Corinthians* had; and——that place (or a place of equal Dimensions) which will hold three

(a) Def. chap. 3. p. 10. (b) Confid. p. 6.

thousand on a Sabbath, will contain fifteen hundred on any day of the Week. To this I answer; that St. Peter did without all doubt preach this Sermon in a public place of Concourse, probably in the Temple; and 'twas the ordinary practice of the Apostles to preach in such public places for the Conversion of Souls, as often as occasion offer'd. But that this Sermon was preached on a Sabbath, you cannot prove. And tho' you could prove it, yet the difficulty still returns; for the question is not, whether St. Peter, or any other Apostle did ever preach in a public place of Concourse on a Sabbath; but whether the Apostles and first Ministers of Churches used to have their meetings, with such as were actually baptized, for the exercise of Christian Communion in Prayer and Sacraments, in such public places of Concourse. This, I say, is the question; and I suppose no man will deny, but that when they met for this end, they met (as I have (a) elsewhere said) in the large rooms of private houses, and for that reason in no great Numbers. And accordingly the fifteen hundred Christians at Corinth must have been parcelled out into diverse distinct Congregations or particular Churches.

But you (b) say, if they met in the large rooms of private houses, and for that reason in no great Numbers; then they had not such large Numbers of Converts in those daies, as I have but just before suggested. Admirably well argued, and exactly like your self! What opinion you may be of, Sir, I cannot say: but I dare say, that other persons, as wise as your self, will grant, that thirty Christian Congregations, each of which consists of fifty per-

(a) Def. ch. 3. p. 10, 11.

(b) Confid. p. 7, 8.

sons, will (tho' they meet in different places) as certainly make up the Number of fifteen hundred Christians; as if all the fifteen hundred Christians met together in the same place, and made but one single Congregation.

Again; you ply me with a fresh Objection. You (a) think, that the phrase *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ*, used by St. Paul, 1 Cor. 11. 20. imports, that the *Corinthians* met in one Congregation, and consequently made but one particular Church. You grant, that that phrase does not alwaies signify *in one place*; but you think it do's necessarily so signify here; because they were all at the Lord's Table together. But, Sir, they might come together at the Lord's Table, tho' every one did not come to the *same* Table. The People of *London* do come together to the Lord's Table; but certainly all of them do not come to *one* and the *same* Table. And why may not the Phrase be thus used by St. Paul concerning the *Corinthians*; as well as by your self or me concerning the *Londoners*?

But you (b) say; *Should one come and tell you, that Mr. Bennet, and six or seven of his Colchester friends, were met together; what could you, or any man that was under an intellectual Conduct, and in the free exercise of his reason, understand by that expression, but that they were in the same place together.* Really, Sir, I am half afraid, that you are not *under an intellectual Conduct, and in the free exercise of your Reason*; because you do not seem to understand the difference between the meeting of a few friends, and the meeting of such a number of people for Religious Ends, as must of necessity be divided into diverse distinct Congregations.

(a) P. 10, 11.

(b) P. 9.

If I should say, that Mr. *Gilson* and Mr. *Gledhill*, and half a dozen of their *Colchester* friends, used to meet very often together; you might indeed reasonably suppose, that they met in the same room together. Unless perhaps you take Mr. *Gilson* and Mr. *Gledhill*, and half a dozen of their friends, for such Monstrous Giants, as you have (a) made of Mr. *How*, whom you represent as a person that is twenty Cubits, which at the lowest computation is *ten Yards*, taller than my self. But if I should say, that all the Dissenters in *Colchester* used to meet together on Sundaies for Religious Worship; I think, no man that is *under an intellectual conduct*, and *in the free exercise of his reason*, would imagin, that they all met in one and the same place, since the Number of them is so great, that you know they are forced to have distinct Meeting-houses.

Wherefore, since I have proved, that the Number of Christians at *Corinth* was so great, that they must of necessity have been parcelled into diverse distinct Congregations for Religious Worship; 'tis plain, that the Christians at *Corinth* may as properly be said to meet together, to receive the Lord's Supper, tho' not all at one and the same Table; as the Dissenters at *Colchester* may for the same or the like end.

You have still another shift. *Can we suppose* (say (b) you) *that Clemens Romanus should not know, whether there were one or more Churches in that City?* I am heartily content, Sir, that *Clemens Romanus* should know as much as you please; and what then? You add, that *he writes, not to the*

(a) *Serm. of Sep. &c. p. 93.* (b) *Consid. p. 5.*

Churches, but to the Church, in Corinth. Yes, and so does St. Paul too. And from thence it plainly follows, that the several distinct Congregations of Christians, which I have proved were then at *Corinth*, did make but one and the same Church of *Corinth*. And this is agreeable to the use of the Word (*ἐκκλησία*) *Church* in holy Scripture. Wherein, tho' it sometimes signifies the Whole Body of Christians all the World over, as *Ephes.* 1. 22. and sometimes a single particular Congregation, as *Rom.* 16. 5. yet at other times it signifies the Whole number of Christians living in one City, tho' parcelled out into many distinct particular Churches or Congregations; as *Acts* 11. 22. where the Church of *Jerusalem* is mentioned; which Church of *Jerusalem*, as I have evidently proved, did at that very time contain many distinct particular Churches or Congregations. And since the Holy Scriptures do use the Word *Church* after this Manner, I know no reason, why St. Clement might not do the same.

But, say you, *suppose there were five or six (particular) Churches in Colchester; would not that Man write at a wild rate, that should superscribe his letter thus, To the Church of God in Colchester, without specifying which of the Churches he means?* Now, if you are resolved to make the Penmen of the Holy Scriptures, and the ancient Fathers, write at a wild rate, I cannot help it. I have made it evident, that the Word *Church* is so used in Scripture; and if this wont do, I shall offer nothing more in defence of St. Clement.

However, give me leave by the way to remind you of your particular friend, neighbor and acquaintance Mr. R. Gouge. He has superscrib'd his Dedication of his *Faith of Dying Jacob*, to the *Church of Christ at Great Cogshal*. And yet I presume, there

is another particular Church of Christ at Great Cogshal, besides that of Mr. Gouge's. And does not Mr. Gouge then write at a *wild rate*, because he does not mention what Church he means?

Again, you yourself do speak of the *Church of England*; by which, I presume, you understand a considerable number of particular Churches or Congregations united together and established in one Kingdom. Now I would fain know, why the distinct particular Churches at *Corinth* may not as properly be called the *Church of Corinth*; as the many distinct particular Churches establish'd by Law in this Kingdom, are called the *Church of England*. Certainly, if the Word *Church* may not be thus used, you must then by the *Church of England* mean some one particular Church among the rest that are established by Law. And consequently, when you talk of your leaving the *Church of England*, you must by your own confession write *at a wild rate*; because you have not specified, which particular Church of *England* you mean. And I appeal to your self, whether that Man be not extremely well qualified to write in defence of Non-Conformity, who by his own confession writes *at a wild rate* in the very Title Page of his Book. But enough of this matter.

I hope, I have now fully answered all your Objections against my Assertion; and may therefore lay it down for a certain truth, that there were diverse distinct particular Churches at *Corinth*, when St. Paul writ his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*.

But, tho' this were granted, yet you tell (a) me, it would be evident, that it was to one particular Church

(a) Pag. 13.

Mr. Shepherd's Considerations. 15

among the rest, that the Apostle and S. Clement wrote their Epistles to. But surely you don't consider, that if it be evident, that they writ their Epistles to one particular Church among the rest; then it is also evident, that in your opinion they writ *at a wild rate.* For you have assured us, that he does so, who writes to one particular Church among the rest, without specifying which of the Churches he means. Now you own, that to suppose this of St. Clement, would be (a) *a very absurd supposition.* And why it should not be much more absurd to suppose it of St. Paul, for my part I cannot divine.

But say (b) you, *if there were more Churches than one at Corinth, then Mr. Bennet has unawares done the Dissenters a singular kindness.* The truth on't is, I am alwaies ready to do the Dissenters as many singular kindnesses, as lie in my power. But what singular kindness was it, I pray, which 'twas my happiness to do them *unawares?* Why, it seems, 'tis this; I have proved that there were more particular Churches than one at Corinth. And if the proving of this be a singular kindness to the Dissenters, I am really glad of it; and I wonder what reason you had to expose your self in endeavoring to disprove it.

But yet I can't perceive, how the proving of this is a singular kindness to the Dissenters. Why, you tell me, *then it appears that there may be several (particular) Churches in a City or Town without Schism.* And who ever deny'd this? God forbid, that the great Numbers of Christians in any one place should be the Necessary Cause of Schism; and that the more the Gospel flourishes in it, the more the sin of Schism should rage also.

(a) Pag. 5. (b) Pag. 13.

But which way I have proved, that there may be several particular Churches in a City or Town *without Schism*, by proving that there were several particular Churches in *Corinth*, I do not understand. But it seems, because I have proved, that there were several particular Churches in *Corinth*, amongst which *there was a very great Schism*; from thence you conclude, that there may be several particular Churches in a City or Town *without any Schism at all*.

But I am still to seek, how my proving that there were several particular Churches at *Corinth*, could be a singular kindness to the Dissenters. Why then, say you (and now the Secret is discovered) *I hope there may be different Congregations hereafter in Colchester or Braintree, without Schism*. But let me beg you to consider once again the Vast difference between the State of those particular Churches in a City or Town, which live in peace and love; and the State of the Dissenting Congregations in *Colchester* and *Braintree*. 'Tis most certain, that the Dissenting Congregations in *Colchester* and *Braintree* are set up without reason, in opposition to the Congregations of the Established Church; and are therefore Schismatical: tho' the several distinct Congregations of the Established Church are not Schismatical.

C H A P. II.

That Mr. Shepherd has dropt the main Controversy between himself and the Author.

AND now, Sir, having vindicated my proof, that there were several Congregations of Christians at *Corinth*, when *St. Paul* writ his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, I would gladly have proceeded to the Vindication of what I have written concerning the main Controversy between your self and me. But your great Prudence has obliged you, for *weighty Reasons*, to bestow none of your *Considerations* upon that which chiefly deserved them.

You cannot but know, that I have evidently proved in the fifth Chapter of my *Defence*, that *alib* there had been but one Congregation of Christians at *Corinth*, when *St. Paul* writ his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*; yet there may be a true and proper Schism, in the scriptural sense of that word, between distinct particular Churches. To this you (a) reply, that such want of Love is sinful, but not schismatical, and you don't call it Schism, because the Scriptures do not call it so. But you very well know, Sir, that I have proved, that the Scriptures do call it Schism, and consequently, that 'tis Schismatical in the Scripture-sense of Schism; because the general Notion of Schism, as delivered in the Holy Scriptures, agrees to this Want of Love. And shall your bare denial be thought an answer to evident proof?

(a) *Consid.* p. 14.

You (b) say, *you do not know, why we should give new names to things.* But, Sir, I had proved, that this was no *new* name, but an old name authorized by Scripture. Again, you say, *you cannot allow it to be Schism, because the Scriptures alwaies speak of Schism as a sin.* And have not you you self confessed (but a few lines before) that *such want of love is sinful?* But *separation*, say you, *in some cases is an high privilege.* And what then? The question is, whether that separation which you now speak of, *viz.* a want of love between particular Churches, be a high privilege. You say, *Separation* (in some cases) *is as much commanded, as Schism is forbidden.* But is that Separation, which you now speak of, *viz.* a want of love between particular Churches, as much commanded at any time, as Schism is forbidden? If it be, how can it be sinful, as you confess it is? But to be brief; Separation between particular Churches is alwaies sinful on one side or other; and therefore the Separation you are speaking of, may be a Schism, notwithstanding what you have said to the contrary.

Had you considered, and endeavored to answer, what I have urged to prove, that what you call *Separation*, is in reality a true and proper *Schism* in the Scriptural sense of the word *Schism*; then I should either have defended my Assertion, or submitted to your Reasons against it. But I am by no means obliged to take your bare denial of a Scripture-notion, to be a Confutation of that Notion, and of what I have written concerning it.

But to let all these things pass, as matters of little moment, you cannot but remember, that in my sixth Chapter I came to the very knot and pinch of the Controversy between your self and me. I told you plainly, that (c) *since we agree in our notion of Schism, when the breach of peace and love is in a particular Church: I shall not quarrel with you about the word Separation, used instead of Schism, when the breach is between different Churches. We are so far agreed, that what both you and I call Schism, viz. a breach of peace and love in a particular Church, is a damnable sin. Nay, you tell me, that No body denies it. We are also agreed, that a breach of love and union between different Churches (which you call Separation, but I call it Schism) is a damnable sin; and that the guilt of it must be charged on those that cause it. Now you tell me, that you own a Separation from the Church of England.—Since then there is a Separation, and since Separation is a damnable sin; 'tis plain that there is the guilt of a damnable sin (whether the sin be Schism or Separation) to be charged on one side or other. The question therefore is, Whether the guilt of this Schism (or Separation, if you please) be to be charged on us of the Established Church, or on your dissenting brethren.*

Then I proceeded to the stating and determination of that question; and I appeal to those, who have given themselves the trouble of reading what I then writ, whether I have not stated the question fairly in that sixth Chapter, and determined it also fairly, by answering all your Objections, in six other following Chapters.

(c) Def. ch. 6. p. 18, 19.

What have you reply'd to all this? Why truly (except to one of your Self-contradictions, which came in by the by, and of which more hereafter) To all this I say, you have reply'd NOT ONE WORD. You (d) pretend indeed, that *I say nothing new, or with more strength than others, that have wrote already, but with less.* You add, that *if the same things spoken more becomingly by others have not satisfied the Dissenters, why should they satisfy as coming from me?* How true this pretence is, I am heartily content that others should determine, who have read those Papers, which you think it your most advisable way to despise.

But why do you fly to this sham-pretence? You know, Sir, we were actually engag'd in a Controversy, which turns upon the determination of this single Question, *Whether the terms of Lay-Communion with the Established Church of England be lawful, or no.* We entered upon the Examination of those terms. I answered all your Objections. And *why have not you replied to my Answers?* Give me leave to tell you, Sir, that whoever has read my Answers, will readily guess that there is at the bottom a very different Reason from what you pretend; which forced you to be silent, and to drop this, which is the principal Part (or rather, the Whole) of the Controversy between us.

I must now speak of that Self-contradiction, which I lately mentioned. In my tenth Chapter I charged you with contradicting the 26th Article of our Church, which (as a Dissenting Teacher) you have subscribed, in two Particulars. Your prudence has obliged you to take no notice of one of

(d) *Confid.* p. 15.

'em; and I shall endeavor to convince you, that it had been advisable for you to slip over the other also, rather than to expose your self by the denial of a plain matter of fact.

I told you, that you said, that *God never sent any but whom his Spirit had previously qualified by a gracious Change upon his own heart; and that a Sensual Clergy were never sent by God.* Whereas you have subscribed, and thereby professed it to be your real opinion and belief, that *Evil Clergymen do minister in Christ's Name, and by God's Commission, and that sometime the Evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments.*

Now, tho' you do not deny the Truth of my Quotations out of the Article and your own Book; yet you (e) tell me, that *you don't contradict your self or the Article.* And why? Why, because *the Article saies, such ought to be deposed.* And what then? Will it follow, that because Evil Ministers ought to be deposed, therefore Evil Ministers (tho' not deposed) are not True Ministers? For I appeal to any Man that is *under an intellectual Conduct, or in the free exercise of his Reason,* whether your Words do not necessarily import, that *Evil Ministers are not True Ministers.*

You tell me indeed, that *in your Book you did not treat of a true or false Ministry, but rather was shewing, what sort of Ministry was to be preferred by us.* But this is manifestly false. For in your Book you did certainly treat of a true or false Ministry. For you shewed what Ministers were, and what were not *sent by God.* And if that be not treating of a true or false Ministry, then I know not what is. Unless perhaps you be of opinion, that a Ministry's

being, or not being *sent by God*, does not make it a true or false Ministry. But to proceed.

In my thirteenth Chapter I proved, that since our terms of Lay-Communion are lawful, therefore the Dissenters are Schismatics by your own confession, and upon your own Principles. This I suppose, you would bestow none of your *Considerations* upon for the same reason; *viz.* because I *say nothing new*, &c.

Then I shewed at large, that (this principle, *viz.* *that our terms of Lay-Communion are lawful*, being proved and supposed true) 'tis impossible for the Dissenters to escape the force of one at least of those three Arguments, which I urged against them in my *Discourse of Schism*. And here indeed, you have excepted against a few passages.

1. I charged the Dissenting Teachers with usurping the Ministerial Office, as being not Ordained by the imposition of a Bishop's hands; and I called for one single instance, during the first six hundred years after Christ, of a person whose Orders were acknowledged to be valid, tho' he was not so Ordained. Here you give me (f) two Instances, which you have borrowed from Mr. *Baxter*, to prove that a Man may be validly Ordained to the Ministry without the Imposition of a Bishop's hands. The one is St. *Matthias*, Acts 1.26. The other is St. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*.

Now as to the first of these Instances, we read expressly, that St. *Matthias* (tho' 'tis probable, he had formerly received the Imposition of our Saviour's own hands, and that the History in the first Chapter of the *Acts*, is not the History of his Ordination to the Ministry, but only of his being ta-

ken into the Number of the Apostles, and dignified with that extraordinary Character; I say, tho' this is probable, yet we read expressly, that He) was numbred with the Eleven Apostles by the immediate Designation of God himself. And therefore, tho' St. *Matthias* had never received any Imposition of hands at all; yet this instance does by no means prove, that such persons as cannot pretend to such an immediate Divine Designation, may be Ordained to the Ministry without the Imposition of a Bishop's hands.

Nay farther, if St. *Matthias* had never received the Imposition of our Saviour's own hands; yet (tho' he was numbred with the Eleven Apostles by an immediate divine Designation) 'tis very probable that he received the Imposition of the Apostles hands, who were certainly Bishops. The History indeed is very short, and does not relate this particular: but yet Almighty God did either by his immediate Designation supersede this ordinary Rite of Admission to the Ministry, or he did not. If he did supersede it, then the instance is impertinent, as I have already shewn; but if he did not supersede it, then we have all imaginable reason to believe, either that our Saviour, or that the Apostles hands were laid upon him, tho' the Historian does not expressly mention it.

As for the second Instance, 'tis a manifest Falshood, as appears from that very Author, whom (g) Mr. *Baxter* quotes, viz. St. *Gregory Nyssen*.

(g) See Mr. Calamy's *Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's Life*, chap. 7. p. 138. Lond. 1702. But if the Reader will consult the *Original Life of Mr. Baxter*, Append. Numb. 2. he will find that Mr. Baxter himself has said enough to obviate this Mistake.

as a true Ordination. Whereas whoever reads St. Gregory Nyssen's own Words, quoted in the Margin, will find, that he has said nothing like it: but yet, it seems, 'twas a Consideration which made him submit to Phadimus's Intreaties, and be regularly Ordained with *all the usual Solemnities*, as St. Gregory Nyssen assures us, and consequently, *by Imposition of hands*.

Another Assertion of yours is remarkable. You (i) tell me that the Notion of the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters is a novelty, which came first among us in Bishop Laud's time, &c. Whereas every body knows, that the 36th Article of our Church declares, that the Book of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons, was set forth in K. Edward the Sixth's daies; and Mr. Calamy, whom you your self have quoted in the very Page before this, tells (k) you, that in this Book it is asserted, that Bishops, Priests and Deacons, are three distinct Orders; and that the whole Book is bottomed upon that supposition, as its foundation; and that for this reason your Brethren the Non-Conformist Teachers cannot declare their Assent and Consent to it.

2. I had said, that the Established Clergy are the Proper Ministers of the People. No, say (l) you, for many of the Established Clergy do want what is Essential to a Gospel-Minister; that is, Election by the People, and their putting themselves under their Care: and you (m) blame me for not proving the Contrary. But, Sir, if it cannot be proved from Scripture, that the Election of the People is Essential to a Gospel-Minister; then the very Silence of the Scripture is

(i) *Confid.* p. 68. (k) *Abridgment*, ch. 10. p. 515, 516.
 (l) *Confid.* p. 69. (m) *P.* 72.

For St. Gregory Nyssen saies (h) expressly, that after St. Gregory Thaumaturgus was prevailed upon to undertake the Work of the Ministry, *all the usual Solemnities of Ordination were performed*, of which we know that Imposition of hands was the principal.

Nay, 'tis plain from St. Gregory Nyssen's Words, that Imposition of hands was then accounted necessary. For he says, that when St. Gregory Thaumaturgus at first refused Ordination, Phadimus instead of Laying on of hands, consecrated him, tho' absent, by Prayer to God. From whence it appears, that had he been present, and willing to be Ordained, the way of conferring Orders was by Imposition of hands.

Now that solemn Consecration of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus was not an Ordination, nor could he have exercised the Ministerial Function by vertue of it; tho' Mr. Baxter, I confess, has confidence enough to say, that St. Gregory Nyssen speaks of it

(h) Τότε χεῖρι ὁρμῇ πρὸς τὴν χειροτονίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπαρτίσας ὁ Φαδῖμος, ἐδὶν αὐτῷ τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἐπίσκεψης, ὡς καὶ τῇ Γρηγορίῳ διαρρήξας, τῶν ἡμερῶν οὐδὲν ἐμείνε ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπίσκεψης. ὡς καὶ τῇ Θεῷ ἀναβλέψας, ἔειπεν ὁμοίως αὐτῷ πρὸς τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρει ἐκείνῳ ὑπὸ τῇ Θεῷ ἐκδοθέντα, ἀλλὰ χεῖρὸς ἐπέθηκε τῇ Γρηγορίῳ τὸ λόγον, ἀφαιρῶντας τὸ Θεῷ τὸν ἁγιασμόν, ἔπειτα ἀποκαθάρσας αὐτὸν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, ὡς καὶ τῇ Γρηγορίῳ μίχεται τὸ πᾶν χρόνον ἔπειτα τῇ πόλει τὴν ἐκείνην κατέχευε, ὡς ἀπέχεον ἄλλοι τὸν οἰκιστὴν αὐτῆς πρὸς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τὴν περιουσίαν, μὴ πλείους εὐεργετήσας τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὰς παραδιδόνειν τὸν λόγον τῇ πίστει. ἔπειτα τῷ αὐτῷ ὑπελάμβανεν τὸν ζυγὸν καὶ ἀνάβλεψεν, πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἐκείνην ὡς τὸν οἰκιστὴν αὐτῆς πρὸς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ βραχὺν χρόνον ἀποστρέψας παρὰ τῇ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπικηρύττει, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ μυστήριον ἀπεδείκναι, ὡς καὶ, κατὰ τὸ φησὶν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, σαρκεὶ καὶ αἵματι ἀποδείκναι ὡς καὶ τῷ Θεῷ ἵδοιεν ἡτὶ γινέσθαι αὐτῷ τὴν τῇ κερύσει φανερῶς. ἔπειτα αὐτὸν ἐπέχευε τὸν λόγον κερύσει, ὡς καὶ τῷ Θεῷ ἐμφανίαν ἐκκαλυφθῆναι αὐτῷ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Gregor. Nyssen. Vit. Thaumaturgi, Paris. 1638. Tom. 3. Pag. 544. 545.

as a true Ordination. Whereas whoever reads St. Gregory Nyssen's own Words, quoted in the Margin, will find, that he has said nothing like it: but yet, it seems, 'twas a Consideration which made him submit to Phadimus's Intreaties, and be regularly Ordained with *all the usual Solemnities*, as St. Gregory Nyssen assures us, and consequently, *by Imposition of hands*.

Another Assertion of yours is remarkable. You (i) tell me that the Notion of the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters is a novelty, which came first among us in Bishop Laud's time, &c. Whereas every body knows, that the 36th Article of our Church declares, that the Book of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons, was set forth in K. Edward the Sixth's daies; and Mr. Calamy, whom you your self have quoted in the very Page before this, tells (k) you, that in this Book it is asserted, that Bishops, Priests and Deacons, are three distinct Orders; and that the whole Book is bottomed upon that supposition, as its foundation; and that for this reason your Brethren the Non-Conformist Teachers cannot declare their Assent and Consent to it.

2. I had said, that the Established Clergy are the Proper Ministers of the People. No, say (l) you, for many of the Established Clergy do want what is Essential to a Gospel-Minister; that is, Election by the People, and their putting themselves under their Care: and you (m) blame me for not proving the Contrary. But, Sir, if it cannot be proved from Scripture, that the Election of the People is Essential to a Gospel-Minister; then the very Silence of the Scripture is

(i) *Confid.* p. 68. (k) *Abridgment*, ch. 10. p. 515, 516.
 (l) *Confid.* p. 69. (m) *P.* 72.

a demonstration, that it is not *Essential*. 'Twas therefore your proper business to produce Arguments for it; for my denying, that there were any Scriptural Arguments for it, was in reality a very conclusive Argument against it. 'Tis true, you have now offered some very weak things in favour of popular Election; but this Tenet has been so largely exposed and confuted by your Dissenting Brethren themselves, that I need do no more, than refer you to what the Assembly of Divines has said, *Jus Divin.* Chap. 8. p. 127, &c. *Edit. Lond.* 1654.

3. I had said, that the Dissenters are to be blamed for our being divided into opposite parties. This you (n) deny; but what I have already said elsewhere, and the plain matter of fact, do daily prove that I spake the Truth.

You (o) say, *You gave me two or three instances of those that did set up their own ministry, and in plain opposition to others, and did draw away the people after 'em, who yet were confessedly no Schismatics.* You add, that *I very wisely slipt over these instances.* Very wisely indeed; because justly. For your instances are nothing at all to the present purpose. 'Tis true, you (p) speak of some persons, who set up themselves in opposition to *Arians* and *Schismatics*, and drew away the People from *such* Teachers. And when the Established Church is *Arian* or *Schismatical*, you may safely draw her Members into an opposite Communion. But Remember, that till then 'tis sinful so to do.

These are your exceptions against my three Arguments; and I am willing the reader should judge of the Weight of them. But give me leave, Sir, to put you now in mind, that in the h Chap-

13t

(n) P. 73. (o) P. 76. (p) *Serm. of Separ.* &c. p. 91.

ter of the *Defence* I added another Argument, drawn from your own words; by which I evidently proved, that the Dissenters are Schismatics for separating from a Church, which has true Doctrine, right discipline, and commanded Worship. You must not take ill, if I say, you have done in this, as in many other instances; that is, slipt it over, because you could not answer it.

In the last place I must observe, that you (q) are willing to have the truth or falshood of your Dissenting Ministry tried by this rule, whether their Doctrine be true, and their Conversation holy. Now if this be the test, Sir, your Cause is desperate. For since there is a Schism between the Established Church of *England*, and the Dissenters; and since I have abundantly proved, that this Schism is to be charged on the Dissenters side; therefore 'tis plain, that the Dissenting Ministers are not true Ministers by your own rule. Because they are guilty of habitual Schism, which is (I am sure) utterly inconsistent with holy Conversation. *Ye shall know them by their fruits*, saies our blessed Lord, speaking of the false prophets; and if Schism be not one of those fruits, for my part I know not what is. Wherefore those Deluded people, who follow such deceitful Guides, ought frequently to read, and diligently to practise that excellent rule which *St. Paul* gives them, *Rom. 16. 17, 18.* Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the Doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not our Lord *Jesus Christ*, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.

(q) *Confid.* p. 77, 78.

C H A P. III.

The 14th Chapter of the Defence of the Discourse of Schism, Vindicated.

IN my 14th Chapter I discovered two of your gross Untruths. You have thought it advisable to say nothing of the second: but you endeavor to palliate the first. I shall therefore examin your Excuses, and submit the Matter to the Reader's Judgment.

You (a) said, that the Clergy of the Established Church *must give the Lord's Supper to every scandalous person.* This I said was a gross Untruth: and I proved from the Common-prayer-book and Canons, that the Established Clergy are so far from being obliged to give the Lord's Supper to every Scandalous person, that they are strictly forbid so to do.

To this you (b) answer, *True*; that is, 'tis true, that the Established Clergy are forbid to give the Lord's Supper to every Scandalous person. And surely then, when you said that they *must* do otherwise, you said what is false.

But, tho' you grant it to be true, that the Established Clergy are forbid to give the Lord's Supper to every Scandalous person; yet you have said in the very same Line, that *your Charge holds firm notwithstanding.* That is, *the Established Clergy are forbid to give the Lord's Supper to every Scandalous person*; and yet at the same time, *the Established Clergy*

(a) *Sermons of Separ.* &c. p. 66. (b) *Consid.* p. 18.

must give the Lord's Supper to every Scandalous person. I pray, Sir, is not this what we call a Self-contradiction? But I am willing to see, how you can reconcile such contradictory Propositions.

1. You say, *He may not of himself stop or debar such a person, without acquainting the Bishop within fourteen days.* But tho' he be commanded to acquaint the Bishop within fourteen daies; yet he stops and debars him notwithstanding. The question is not, what the Minister must do, after he has stopped and debarred him; but whether he may stop and debar him, or no. *He does it then, say you, as the Bishop's Curate.* And what then? Under what denomination soever he does it, *he does it notwithstanding.*

And yet, by the way, I would fain know, how a Clergy-man's acquainting the Bishop with what he does, can make him the Bishop's Curate. You know, Sir, that a Dissenting Teacher cannot erect a Meeting-house and preach therein, without acquainting some of Her Majesties Justices of the Peace. Nay, he must acquaint them *before-hand* too; and that is more than the Established Clergy are obliged to, before they can deny the Lord's Supper to a Scandalous person. But would any Man argue from thence, that the Dissenting Teachers do erect Meeting-houses, and preach in them, as the Justices Curates?

You add, that he who is obliged to acquaint the Bishop within fourteen daies, after he has denyed the Lord's Supper to a Scandalous person, *is not himself in the use and exercise of that Ministerial and Pastoral Power, wherewith Christ has invested him.* And therefore I also add, that by the very same reason, he that can't preach till his Meeting-house is Licensed by some of Her Majesties Justices of the

the Peace, is not himself in the Use and Exercise of that Ministerial or Pastoral Power, wherewith Christ has invested him.

Let us now put this Argument of yours into Syllogistical form. The thing, you know, to be proved is, this; *viz.* That tho' the Established Clergy are forbid to give the Lord's Supper to every Scandalous person, yet your Charge, that *they must give it him*, holds firm notwithstanding. Well then, you argue thus,

If a Clergy-man must acquaint the Bishop within fourteen daies, that he has actually denied the Lord's Supper to a Scandalous person; then, tho' he has actually denied it him, yet he is at the same both forbid and commanded to give it him. Or thus; If a Clergy-man acts as the Bishop's Curate, when he actually denies the Lord's Supper to a Scandalous person; then he is at the same time both forbidden and commanded to give the Lord's Supper to a Scandalous person. I hope, Sir, you do not expect that I should answer such Arguments, as do so kindly answer themselves.

2. You say, *it wou'd admit of a large dispute, who are scandalous, and who are not.* But one wou'd think, that the Rubrics and Canons have clearly determined this dispute.

3. You pretend, *you did not lay it upon the Laws or Canons.* Well then; if the Clergy are not obliged by the Laws or Canons to give the Lord's Supper to every Scandalous person; I wou'd fain know, which way they are obliged to do it. Why you tell us in the next words, *Such persons are imployed in the Ecclesiastical Courts, that in the whole, matters are so managed, and de facto, the thing is so as you have said; and he that acts with that just strictness, shall quickly find himself in the midst of great troubles, as you your self did; nor considering the present posture*

posture of things, can that strictness and impartiality be born. To this I answer, that every syllable of it is utterly false. For every body knows, that the Ecclesiastical Courts cannot take cognizance of any thing, but what contradicts either the Laws or the Canons: and therefore if neither the Laws nor the Canons do oblige the Established Clergy to give the Lord's Supper to every Scandalous person; then those Courts cannot lay hold of them for denying it. Nay farther, those very Courts may, and will, when proof is given, severely punish any Clergyman whatsoever, that presumes (either against his own knowledge, or against good information from others) to give the Lord's Supper to any Scandalous person.

But, say you, *Matters are so managed, &c.* But I say again, that all this is utterly false. And I challenge you to give me so much as one single Instance, from the time of the Reformation to this very day, of any one Clergy-man in any part of *England*, who was ever punished in the Ecclesiastical Courts for denying the Lord's Supper to a Scandalous person.

And as for your saying, that you your self suffered for acting with that just strictness, it is manifestly false by your own confession. For you (c) acknowledge, that *the Suspension was not laid upon that*. Nay, you add, that *the Ecclesiastical Courts have more sense, than to lay it upon that which will not bear it*. In which words you plainly affirm, that the denying the Lord's Supper to a Scandalous person will not bear a Suspension in our Ecclesiastical Courts.

(c) Pag. 35.

"Tis true, you have said in your very next Words, that *your Parishioners, and the whole Neighborhood laid it there, as well as your self.* But if your self, your Parishioners, and the whole Neighborhood, were resolved to lay it wrong; I can't help it. You confess, that the Court laid it upon something else; and I have elsewhere told you, what they laid it upon, *viz.* your Contumacy, which will very justly bear a Suspension: and with what face then could you, and your Parishioners, and the whole Neighborhood, lay it upon your denial of the Lord's Supper to a Scandalous Person?

I must now proceed to something of a blacker die. I found my self obliged in this 14th Chapter, to discover the naked truth of a certain matter of fact, by which it appeared, that you had in open Court acknowledged your self to be a Liar and a perjured person divers times. I then related that Story with great brevity, and with all possible tenderness towards your self. But you have been bold enough to outface the Evidence I then gave, and to deny the Charge: and consequently you have now forced me to speak more fully and plainly than before.

What I said before, was drawn from the Records of the Court, in which you were presented. And if those Records may be credited, the matter is past dispute. And that they may be credited, I think no understanding person will deny; since they were entred by a *Public Notary*, whose bare Attestation is alwaies esteemed evident Proof.

But you (d) say, *the Records were defective, and gave but a partial account*; and that (e) you deny

(d) P. 60.

(e) P. 64.

not the Record, but you deny the justness of that Record. Now 'tis true, the Court-Records do not (nor indeed ought they to) mention either the Dialogues between the Bishop and your self, in which you (f) own, that you spake *not with over great respect of his Lordship and his Conduct*; or your pretended protestation when you repeated your Oath, &c. But, Sir, the question is, whether as much as the Records do certainly mention, be true, or no. For if what they mention be true, 'tis very plain, that (unless what they omit, be contradictory to what they relate; which no understanding person can imagin; I say, if what they mention, be true) 'tis very plain, that my charge was just, whether they mention all that then passed, or no.

You (g) tell me indeed, that *the moderate Churchmen upon the place, and those Dissenters that were Churchmen when you were there (viz. that goodly Mobb, than ran so far (h) ON FOOT to hear your Tryal, and whom you take to be competent judges of such matters) these persons, you say, can testify, that you give a very exact relation.* Now, tho' your own relation does abundantly convict you of what I laid to your charge, as you will find hereafter; yet I could easily shew, that your own relation is miserably defective and partial, and except against the Testimony of that *Rabble* whom you appeal to as Witnesses, and enervate the force of your pretended protestation. But I shall not give my self the trouble of doing these things at present; because I am willing to be as brief as may be, upon an odious subject. I shall therefore confine my self to your undoubted Subscriptions, Promises, and Oath

(f) Pag. 38. (g) Pag. 64. (h) Pag. 30.

of Canonical Obedience, made and taken at your Ordination, and your Admission to the Benefice of St. Neots, without meddling with that Oath, which you confess you took afterwards. And I shall make it appear, with all possible plainness, 1. That *you did frequently violate your said Subscriptions, Promises, and Oath, at that very time, when you believed it lawful for you to observe and keep them.* 2. That *you did acknowledge such a violation of them in open Court.*

First then, you did frequently violate your Subscriptions, Promises, and Oath of Canonical Obedience, made and taken at your Ordination, and your Admission to the Benefice of St. Neots, at that very time when you believed it lawful for you to observe and keep them. This will appear by comparing the said Subscriptions, Promises, and Oath, with your avowed practices.

When you were ordained first *Deacon*, and then *Priest*, and admitted to the Benefice of St. Neots, that is, at three several times, you declared by the Subscription of your hand (according to Canon the 36th) that *you would use the form of Common-prayer prescribed in the Common-prayer-book, in Public Service.* By this Subscription you solemnly promised to use (not a part only, or one part at one time, and another part at another time: but *the form*, that is) the whole form of Common-prayer prescribed in the Common-prayer-book, in Public Service. Whereas your practice was quite otherwise: for you left out, and altered, whatsoever and whensoever you pleased. This appears from your own words; wherein you expressly (i) declare, that *you used to read all the Prayers, tho' not all at one time.* What you omit-

(i) Pag. 43.

read one Lord's day, you read the next. On that day you read the Litany, you omitted the second Service: on the day you read the second Service, you omitted the Litany. Saving that some small passages you sometimes did pass by, or alter. As for instance (tho' you don't now remember all) in the Thanksgiving, when you were in doubts about your own eternal State, You oft passed by the Word Creation. So in the Office for Baptism, instead of these Words, This Child is regenerate, and born again, you would read, this Child is received into the Bosom of the Church. In the Office for Burial, instead of these Words, In sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life, you read, in sure and certain expectation of a resurrection to a future state. And many such like.

Again, when you were ordained first Deacon, and then Priest, that is, at two several times, you promised in the most solemn manner, viz. before the whole Congregation then assembled, at the Lord's Table, and immediately before the reception of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, that you would reverently obey your Ordinary, and other Chief Ministers of the Church, and them to whom the Charge and Government of you should be committed, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions. And when you were ordained Priest, you added a promise to submit your self to their godly judgments. And when you were admitted to the Benefice of St. Neots, you solemnly fwore, that you would pay Canonical Obedience to the Bishop in Lawful and Honest Matters: from all which 'tis plain that you were bound by your Promises and Oath to obey the Bishop with a glad will and mind, if he should command you to use the whole Form of Common-prayer; provided it were lawful and honest for you so to do.

Now the Bishop had commanded you to read the whole Form of Common-prayer; and 'tis plain, that he was angry with you for not reading the whole Form, by your own (k) confession, that he charged you with *turning the Church into a Conventicle*, by omitting and altering what, and when you pleased, as you declare in your next words. Besides, the peoples (l) *urging you perpetually to further compliances with the Bishop*, evidently proves, that the Bishop had often quarrelled with you for your not reading the whole Form. From whence 'tis plain, that you were commanded by the Bishop, and consequently were bound by your Promises upon the Sacrament, and your Oath, to read the whole Form of Common-prayer, provided it were lawful and honest for you so to do.

Well then; since you were obliged by your repeated Subscriptions, Promises upon the Sacrament, and also by your Oath, to read the whole Form of Common-prayer, provided it were lawful and honest for you so to do; the next thing to be considered is, whether at that time, when you would not read the whole Form of Common-prayer, in spite of your Subscriptions, Promises, and Oath; Whether, I say, at that very time you did believe it to be lawful and honest for you to read the whole Form, or no. And this question will easily be determined by the following Certificate, which was returned into the Bishop's Court.

We whose Names are under written, Parishioners of the Parish of St. Neots in Huntingdon-shire, do hereby attest, that Mr. Thomas Shepherd, Vicar of St. Neots in the said County of Huntingdon, did

(k) Pag. 42.

(l) Pag. 27.

Mr. Shepherd's Considerations. 37

on Sunday last, being the fifteenth day of February instant, in the Parish Church of St. Neots aforesaid, read Divine Service, together with the second Service, containing the Commandments, Epistle and Gospel, as the Law requires.

Will. Goodfellow.

Henry Fox.

Tho. Small.

William Collett.

From this Certificate it is plain, that you did believe it lawful and honest for you to read the whole Form of Common-prayer upon the Fifteenth day of February 1690. And consequently it appears, that when you did obstinately refuse so to do, before you were prosecuted; you did then obstinately refuse to do that, which you were strictly bound to do, both by your repeated Subscriptions, your Promises upon the Holy Sacrament, and your Oath; altho' you did at that very time believe it lawful and honest for you to do, what your said Subscriptions, Promises and Oath required of you.

And if this perverse practice of yours in omitting and altering what parts of the Common-prayer you pleased, before the 15th of February 1690, in spite of your Obligation by repeated Subscriptions to use the whole Form, and the positive Commands of your Bishop to do the same; I say, if this perverse practice of yours be not a manifest Violation of your repeated Subscriptions, your Promises upon the Holy Sacrament, and your Oath; then, for my part, I know not what is, or can be a Violation of them.

Here I must take occasion to inform you, that by a mistake (which my distance from the Press wou'd not suffer me to correct) it is said, *Def. p. 78. l. 14.* that you appeared at *Bugden* upon the 15th of Feb. 1690. Whereas it should have been a Figure of Five only; the 5th of February being then a Thursday,

and the 15th (which the Certificate mentions) being the *Sunday* seven-night after.

And now, Sir, the truth of the Charge being evidently proved, I am heartily willing to hear what Excuses you can make for such practices.

1. As for the Violation of your Subscriptions, you (m) say, *you Conformed at first as much as half of the Established Clergy*. Suppose this true, Sir; why then did you not continue so to Conform, as long as you continued in the Established Church? Now how much this Conformity was, which, you say, was as much as half the Established Clergy practise, I cannot determine. If it was such Conformity, as you confess, *pag. 43*. you say what is false; for I am persuaded, you cannot find one Clergyman in a hundred, that Conforms at that rate. But in a word, those that do not Conform according to their Subscriptions, do flatly contradict their Subscriptions; and I freely own that such Traitors to the Church are as certainly guilty of Lying by contradicting their Subscriptions, as your self.

But you add, that *some of your Neighbors conformed abundantly less than you, and yet were under the World's smiles*. Now I cannot believe, that this is true. But because 'tis not my business to search into the State of that County at the time you lived in it; therefore I answer plainly, that if any of your Neighbors were so wicked, they justly deserved severe punishment. And perhaps, had it been my fortune to live near them, as you did, I should have done 'em the kindness to procure it for 'em.

2. As for your Promises upon the Holy Sacrament, you say nothing that particularly excuses the Breach of them. But

(m) *Pag. 47.*

3. You offer many things to excuse you from the guilt of breaking your Oath. You (n) say, *you kept it, so long as you believed it lawful, and was satisfied with it.* Would to God this had been true, Sir. But alas ! 'tis apparently false ; for you believed it lawful to read the whole Form of Common-prayer upon Feb. 15. 1690. and yet you know very well, that you did not read the whole Form till that time ; tho' the Bishop had commanded you to do it.

Ay, but (o) *you kept your Oath in that sense in which you took it, tho' not in the Bishop's sense.* That is, when you sware to obey the Bishop in lawful and honest Matters, you meant, that *you wou'd obey him only when you pleased*, tho' the thing commanded by him were never so lawful and honest. For 'tis plain, that you believed it lawful and honest to obey the Bishop's Command in reading the whole Form of Common-prayer ; or else you could not have read the whole Form of Common-prayer upon Feb. 15. 1690.

You say (p) indeed, that *you could not, nor would do the Work of two Men ; and therefore did, without the Bishop's leave, most regard the main and chief Work of a Minister, considered as such, which lies in Preaching the Gospel, as the whole Evangelical Story does abundantly shew.* And what strength you had to spare by way of overplus ; you employed in humoring Men. Nor did you ever by the Oath mean to bind your self from doing your duty towards God. And was it not possible then for Mr. Shepherd to read the whole Form of Common-prayer, and to do his duty to God by Preaching the Gospel too ? Do not thou-

(n) Pag. 51. (o) Ibid. & p. 54. (p) Pag. 47. 48.

sands of the Established Clergy constantly do both? And was not your own strength sufficient for that fatigue upon Feb. 15. 1690? But I am asham'd to answer such a false, groundless and ridiculous pretence.

You (q) say also, that *when you took the Oath of Canonical Obedience, you meant to oblige yourself to that Conformity, that is generally used and practised in the Church of England, and is allowed by the Governing part of it.* Here you should have remembered, that the Oath of Canonical Obedience is, that you will obey your Bishop in lawful and honest Matters; and doth not relate to your Conformity any otherwise than as 'tis commanded by your Bishop. But to pass over this. If you took the Oath in that sense you speak of, then you plainly confess what I charged you with: For every body knows, that Reading the whole Form of Common-prayer is that Conformity, which is generally used and practised in the Church of *England*, and allowed by the Governing part of it. And I challenge you to name any one Bishop, or other Ordinary, or Ecclesiastical Superior whatsoever, who allows any other Conformity; or who will not (when he knows them) punish such persons as Conform as you did, that is, by halves, or scarce so much. Wherefore, if you obliged your self by Oath to that Conformity which is generally used and practised in the Church of *England*, and allowed by the Governing part of it; 'tis plain by your own confession, that you did not practise that Conformity; and consequently you broke your Oath in that very sense, in which you own you took it.

But you (r) object, that if you be perjured, then the Generality of the Established Clergy are perjured; and (s) that you are in this point altogether upon the same bottom with the Clergy of the Established Church. Hold a little, Sir; and consider, that none of the Established Clergy can be perjured by breaking their Oath of Canonical Obedience, unless they have in some lawful and honest Matter refused to obey the Bishop's Command. Now if you can shew, that the Generality of the Established Clergy have in any one lawful and honest Matter disobeyed the Bishop's Command; then I shall freely confess, that they are perjured as certainly as your self.

You (t) say indeed, that Bishop Barlow laid your Perjury upon your not Conforming according to Canon; and very rightly. For he had commanded you, and consequently you were obliged by Oath, to Conform according to your Subscription by Canon the 36th, which was the Canon he required you to keep. But then you add, that the Established Clergy are under the same Condemnation. For where, who is he among the most superstitious of the Established Clergy, that does in all things Conform according to Canon? And what if they do not in all things Conform according to Canon? Are they for that reason perjured? No surely. For the Established Clergy do not swear to observe the Canons, tho' they swear Canonical Obedience to the Bishop in lawful and honest Matters. 'Tis true, if the Bishop commands the Observation of any particular Canon, which can be lawfully and honestly observed; then 'tis downright Perjury for the Clergy-man to disobey that Canon; because he thereby disobeys the Bishop, whom he is sworn to

(r) P. 56, 57. (s) P. 99. (t) P. 55.

obey. But as for those Canons, which the Bishop does not particularly command the Observation of; as for those Canons, I say, (u) if they are practicable in our present Circumstances, and not annulled by Statute, or grown obsolete; it is a fault not to observe them, because 'tis disregarding the Rules of the Church; but 'tis not Perjury, because we are not sworn to observe them. But I shall not enlarge upon this Matter, which has been (w) cleared by some late Writers.

One thing more I must observe, before I conclude this Point. You (x) say, that when you Conformed, you had just those Notions of Conformity, which Mr. Ollyffe and his Brethren have; viz. those Notions which are in Mr. Ollyffe's *Defence of Ministerial Conformity*. Let this very Book then be the Test of your Guilt. I challenge you to find any one passage in that whole Book, that will in any measure justify you, or even alleviate your sin. Shew me therefore, if you can, that according to Mr. Ollyffe's Notions (which you declare to have been your own) a Clergy-man may, without being guilty of Lying and Perjury, mangle and alter the Form of Common-prayer as you did, notwithstanding his Subscriptions by Can. 36. and the Command of his Bishop, whom he had promised and sworn to obey. *Shew me this, I say, and I will publicly acknowledge my mistake, and proclaim your Innocence to the World.*

Secondly, I am to prove, that you did acknowledge the forementioned Violation of your Subscri-

(u) See Bishop Stillingfleet's *Eccles. Cases*. Lond. 1702. p. 261, &c. (w) See Mr. Hoadly's *Reasonableness of Conformity*, Part 1. Lond. 1703. p. 135, &c. Mr. Ollyffe's *Defence of Ministerial Conformity*. Lond. 1702. p. 84, &c. (x) P. 98.

ptions, Promises and Oath, in open Court. This appears not only from the Court-rolls, which expressly mention it; but also from your own (y) confession, that you promised *to please the Bishop, and carry your self as a worthy man.* These Expressions, uttered in that place, and upon that occasion, cannot but relate to your former carriage and the crimes alledged against you. And consequently, they cannot but import a promise, that you would not for the future carry your self as you had done before; but so as to please the Bishop by ceasing to do those things, which he was displeased with you for, and which were in open Court objected against you. And what Things were those? Why, your Half-conformity, &c. And how did you carry your self before? Why, after a stubborn wilful rate in matters of Conformity, omitting or altering any part of the Common-prayer, when you pleased. This promise therefore, which you confess you made in open Court, was an acknowledgment in open Court of your former guilt.

But in truth, the thing proves it self. For it can't be supposed, that the Court (especially, if particularly incensed against you, as you pretend) would suffer you, who were then actually under Censure for Contumacy, and charged with other Misdemeanors, to have your Suspension taken off, and no other Punishment inflicted; unless you had promised to amend those things, which by the Notoriety of the Fact you were most certainly guilty of. 'Tis plain therefore, that you confessed your guilt; for (were there nothing more) your bare promising to amend, and having a Certificate

of your amendment returned into the Court, do imply a confession of that which was to be amended.

I might now proceed to your relapse, and following Violations of your former Subscriptions, Promises and Oath; and of your second Promises also made in open Court; and of your second Oath too, notwithstanding your pretended Protestation, in what sense you took it. But I resolve to be as concise as possible; and do heartily wish that you had not furnished me with, and forced me to use, the proofs already urged against you. What I have briefly said, is abundantly sufficient to demonstrate, that you did in open Court acknowledge, that you had frequently violated your first Subscriptions, Promises and Oath, even at that very time, when you thought it lawful for you to observe and keep them. And if this be not an open Confession of repeated Lies and Perjuries, then there never was, and never can be such a Confession made.

I could make many severe reflections upon all the parts of your tedious Story, related in your fourth Chapter; wherein you pretend to give a just account of your leaving the Established Church, and of your Sufferings (for the Crimes before mentioned) in our Courts. I am sure, it will well bear, and most justly deserves such Animadversions, as would effectually expose you. 'Tis evident from your own words, that the Bishop had just reason to suspect you, to be against your coming to *St. Neots*, and to have a very watchful eye over you, Nor are his proceedings against you to be blamed, but for the too great Lenity which is apparent in them, even according to your own Narration.

'Tis

'Tis true, you have (z) said, that *the Reverend Dr. Fowler, present Bishop of Gloucester, who in those daies treated you with singular Condescension and Candor, did sufficiently intimate to you, that he had Sentiments vastly different from Bishop Barlow's.* And whoever reads the Context, cannot understand that passage otherwise, than that Bishop Fowler did then intimate to you, that he had Sentiments vastly different from Bishop Barlow's in matters of Conformity, and thought that you were hardly dealt with. Whereas this is a great injury done to his Lordship, who has given me leave to tell you, that he might possibly intimate to you, that he had Sentiments in some things vastly different from Bishop Barlow's, viz. in respect of that Bishop's Calvinistical Tenets: but that he was and is so far from differing from him concerning this matter in dispute, that he did then, and does still think, that no Bishop can lawfully bear with such irregularities, as you have confessed, pag. 43.

By this instance any man may guess, with what integrity you tell your own Story. But I shall not enter upon such Matters as are foreign to my design. I am not obliged to do more, than maintain that charge, which I was absolutely forced to lay upon you; and which I heartily wish for your own sake, that you had never given any just grounds and occasion for.

And now, after all that demonstration of your guilt, which you have constrained me to produce, I am resolved to do that by you, which even your own party cannot but confess to be extremely fair; and what I do not believe you would ever have

done by me. I am therefore most heartily content and desirous to refer this part of the Controversy between your self and me, to the Arbitration of Mr. *Gilson* and Mr. *Gledhil*; who are not only Dissenting Teachers, but your own particular Friends. And if they will give you leave to publish it as their opinion, that you did not violate your Subscriptions, your Promises upon the Holy Sacrament, and your first Oath of Canonical Obedience, at that very time when you believed it lawful for you to observe and keep them; then I do solemnly promise, that I will not, in any thing whatsoever that I may hereafter write, charge you with it.

CHAP. IV.

Remarks upon several Passages of Mr. Shepherd's.

IN my fifteenth Chapter I gave you a Taste of that Rhetoric, under the want of which you said the Nation had groaned, and been sinking deeper and deeper into profaneness from the Feast of St. *Bartholomew* 1662, to this very day. In answer to which you (a) tell me, *you could make reprisals upon the Conformists to their disadvantage, and that he that has a mind to see such trash, may find enough of it gathered together by a Doctor of our own, in a Book he has entituled the Contempt of the Clergy.* Now since you refer me to Dr. *Echard's* Collections, I shall take leave to return you Dr. *Echard's* answer;

(a) *Consid.* p. 82.

who speaking of those Non-Conformists, who think with you, that his Collections are a notable proof of the badness of the preaching used in the Established Church, (b) saies, *they have no reason at all to rejoice at his first Letter* (which is the Book you mention) *because they there find, that such is the imprudence or unhappiness of some of the Clergy, as sometimes to occasion their own contempt.* For if they please to examine again what is there written; they will then perceive their dear brethren to be as much concerned as any body else, and to have as great a share of those instances, that are produced out of idle Sermons. So that it seems, at least half the trash in that very Book was gathered from amongst your selves; and 'tis very probable, for many reasons, that the other half was gathered from amongst such persons as were bred Non-Conformists, tho' they complied at the Restoration.

But I must tell you farther, Sir, that the same Author adds (what you will not be willing to hear) that (c) *if he had thought that the Non-conformists would have been so mistaken, he could have found out as many follies and extravagancies in one daies time out of their Sermons and Discourses, as in a week any where else.* And if you'll be pleased to read a few Pages that follow, you will find great cause to thank that Author for the pains he has taken to expose your Party; and for (d) telling them, that *he is very certain, that the greatest part, or at least the most famous and prevailing amongst them, are so generally addicted to canting, insignificant Phrases, and tedious Tautologies; that should we compare their continual religious Nonsense with*

(b) *Some Observations upon the Answer, &c. in his Works.* Lond. 1696. P. 105. (c) P. 106. (d) P. 110.

the indiscretions of the Conformists, these would appear tolerably sober and wary Rhetoricians. I must still beg you to read on; and if you have any more time to spare for your Diverſion, I recommend to you *L'eſtrange's Diſſenters Sayings.*

You refer me alſo in your (e) Margin to the *Century of Scandalous Miniſters.* This I ſuppoſe was mentioned to expoſe, not the Preaching, but the Vices of ſome of the Eſtabliſhed Clergy in the beginning of the Great Rebellion. I could return you ſuch an answer upon this occaſion, as would not only grate, but draw bloud. But I forbear. Only I muſt inform you, that whatever the Vices of thoſe men were, (for I have never ſeen that Book) I'll undertake to name Diſſenting Miniſters now in *Effex*, that are guilty of as bad, and (I am ſure) much better proved. But to proceed.

I had occaſion in the ſame Chapter to aſk for the Seals of the Diſſenting Miniſtry. This you are pleaſed to take to your ſelf, and you return (f) an account of your own Succeſs. And truly, Sir, when I read *George Fox's* impious Journal, I find as great pretences as your own, and (I verily believe) as true. But you add, *if you can ſay thus much, what can the reſt of your Brethren ſay, who have greater grace, and better gifts and abilities?* Why truly, I ſhall retort the Argument; for if your Brethren who have greater Grace, and better Gifts and Abilities, have done ſo little, as I am ſure they have; then I have ſufficient reaſon (without giving any other) to think that you have done little or nothing.

(e) P. 82.

(f) P. 85.

I perceive, you do not want vanity. You (g) tell me, that *whilst you were at St. Neot's, you were much taken notice of, and followed by the Common people, and that you had a vast auditory.* And might not that Eminently gifted Independent *Hugh Peters*, who rambled about the Country to cheat the old Women of their Gold-Rings, Bodkins and Thimbles, say the very same, without brightening his Character? He that reads the Author you referred me to, may easily account for the multitude of your Followers. See *Dr. Echard's Observat. &c.* p. 137. &c.

As for the necessity of Imposition of hands in Ordination, which you bestow many words upon, I refer you to your Brethren, the Assembly of Divines, who have *made out* (as they tell you) *the divine right of Imposition of hands*, *Jus Divin*, p. 173. &c.

There are some other Passages, which as long as I have room, I shall remark upon.

In the Preface of your Book you charge me (h) with a *deliberate falshood*, for saying that *you have granted, that there is a sinful Separation between the Established Church and the Dissenters.* Now the truth on't is, I have said this of you; and if it be not true, I'll take the shame of a *deliberate falshood* to my self. Otherwise, it belongs to you know whom.

It must be observed then, that I did not say, nor do you charge me with saying, that you granted, that the Sin of the Separation between the Established Church and the Dissenters, is to be charged on the Dissenters side. But you charge

me with saying, what I did really say, that *there is a sinful Separation between the Established Church and the Dissenters*, on which side soever the sin of this Separation is to be charged.

Now that you have granted, that there is a sinful Separation between the Established Church and the Dissenters, is extremely plain. For I have (i) said, that *the whole controversy* (between the Established Church and the Dissenters) *turns upon the determination of this single question*, whether the Established Church does impose any one unlawful term of Lay-Communion, or no. *If the Established Church does impose any one unlawful term of Lay-Communion with her; doubtless she is Schismatical; and the Separation of the Dissenters is not only Lawful, but necessary. But if the Established Church does not impose any one unlawful term of Lay-Communion with her; then 'tis utterly impossible for the Dissenters to justify their Separation from her.* I appeal to any Man living, whether in these words I have not plainly said, that *there is a sinful Separation between the Established Church and the Dissenters*, on which side soever the Sin thereof is to be charged. I am verily persuaded, that no words whatsoever can more plainly contain that assertion.

Now if I my self have said in those words, that *there is a sinful Separation between the Established Church and the Dissenters*, then you have said so too. Because you declare, that you do perfectly agree with me in those words, by (k) saying, that *in those words I have expressed my self very clear and full; and that you desire the Reader to keep those passages in his mind; for that you are as will-*

(i) *Disc. of Schism*, pref. p. 1, 2.
Epist. 9, 10.

(k) *Sermons of Separ.*

ing as my self to take the shortest way, and bring this matter to a speedy issue. From whence 'tis evident, that you allow my words to be true; and that you accept and approve that State of the Controversy, which I have therein given; and that you are willing to join issue upon it. Wherefore since you have made these words of mine your own, by professing that you consent to them; 'tis plain, that if I have said in those words, that *there is a sinful Separation between the Established Church and the Dissenters*; then you have said the very same thing. And consequently, I spake the Real truth, when I said, that you granted, that *there is a sinful Separation between the Established Church and the Dissenters*. And with what face then could you charge me with a *deliberate falshood* for saying that you had granted it?

I could easily prove, that you have frequently said the same thing in other parts of your Book; but that 'tis at present needless so to do. The Reader will sufficiently understand from what has been already said, at whose door the *deliberate falshood* Lies.

However, let me beg you, Sir, for the future to have a great care of charging deliberate falshoods upon others, for fear of increasing that Stock of them, which you must one day answer for your self. That great number of them, which I proved upon you in my *Defence*, and particularly that base falsification of St. Ignatius mentioned in the 16th Chapter (the far greatest part of which deliberate falshoods you have not dared even to excuse) should at least have made you cautious of fastening your own Crimes upon other Persons.

I must now purge my self from something of another Nature. You tell me, that (l) *I dip my pen in flame*, that (m) *I write with bitterness*, that (n) *I bring reproaches instead of arguments*, that (o) *I am a Reviler*, and that (p) *I fill my Book with personal Reflections and provoking Language*. Now the truth on't is, I have charged you in my *Defence* with confessing your self guilty of Lying and Perjury; and it is indeed a personal reflection, which I knew would sit very hard upon you. But then you must Consider, 1. That I was absolutely forced to mention it. 2. That I was so very brief in the relation of it, that it did not fill one Page. 3. That I have given you an absolute demonstration of the truth of it. But I am persuaded that whoever has read those Papers, cannot justly charge me with *filling* my Book with personal reflections. And if the relation of some naked truths, be a *reproach* to you, you must thank none but your self for it; and if you are resolved to call me a *Reviler*, because I was forced to discover something of your wickedness, I shall never be troubled at it.

But then, since you talk of my *dipping my pen in flame*, and *writing with bitterness*, and filling my Book with *provoking language*, I challenge you to give me any one instance of a fiery, bitter, or taunting spirit; tho' all the World must grant, that you have given me the justest occasion of saying the severest things imaginable. 'Twas absolutely necessary for me to take notice of those falsehoods, slanders, self-contradictions, and other beauties of your *Stile*, which I was forced to examine instead

(l) *Confid.* pref. p. 6. (m) *Confid.* p. 1. (n) *Pref.* p. 4.
(o) *Pag.* 20. (p) *Pag.* 95.

of Arguments; and the bare mentioning of such particulars cannot but be, to the guilty person, most *provoking language*. But then, tho' I was bound by my Office to load your Conscience with the guilt of your Crimes, and as a Scholar to expose the weakness of your pretended Reasonings; yet my Words were as soft as the nature of such things could possibly bear; my Reproofs (tho' very home) were given in a Christian manner; and I blamed you for nothing which Charity it self could account a *natural* imperfection. I can assure you, that several good men have taxed me with writing *roughly* against one, who in their opinion deserves the coarsest treatment. If I was sometimes less grave, my mirth was alwaies innocent. I defy malice it self to point at one syllable of *profaness*, tho' you (q) have falsely charged me with it. I did not mention some strange passages of Mr. Gouge's in particular, because they would obscure the Majesty of God. But in other matters, whensoever I touch upon that which is *extravagantly* ridiculous, I confess, I must laugh a little, and cannot help it.

However, suppose I had really *dip't my pen in flame*, and written with *bitterness*, and filled my Book with *provoking language*; I pray, had Mr. Shepherd any reason to complain? Let me intreat you, Sir, to review those particulars which I have observed in my *Defence*, especially the 10th Chapter. You know I appealed (r) to any indifferent judge, *whether it be possible for any thing on this side the bottomless pit to be more vile and abominable, than the Generality of the Established Clergy (the Bishops*

(q) Pag. 80. (r) Def. p. 45.

themselves not excepted) are, according to your description of them in that Book which I then examined. You (s) had represented them as such profligate Wretches, that if they die in their present condition, they must infallibly go to the Devil. If your words be true, many of them are downright Deists or Atheists; worse than Socinians, and even than the very Turks; are either mere Heathens, or mere Jews, Blasphemers of the Holy Ghost; nay, Devils incarnate, or at least Factors for the Devil, &c. Was there not, think you, something of flame in your Pen, and of bitterness in your Writing, and provoking language in your Book? And are you a fit person to reprove these faults in others?

But you are resolved to be alwaies the same, and to rail as heartily in this Book as you did in the other. For instance, (tho' I shall not mention every thing of this nature) you represent the whole Established Church, both Clergy and Layety, as a mere Synagogue of Satan, and the very Seat of Antichrist, saying that (t) 'tis a great absurdity to imagine, that such a man can sit easy among 'em, that cannot set the Church above Christ; that the Clergy are (u) Jovial, and not over-serious, and (w) a dumb, ignorant or careless Ministry, and are (x) well suited to an unthinking, careless people.

You say, Bishop Barlow was (y) a hard-hearted and Tyrannical Man, who shewed no pity to tender Consciences (that is, such Consciences as your own, which made no bones of Lying and Perjury) but rather laid more Irons on them, resembling therein the grand enemy of mankind; that is, Bishop Barlow

(s) See this proved, Def. p. 42, 43, 44. (t) Confid. p. 27.
 (u) P. 82. (w) P. 76. (x) P. 82. (y) P. 37, 38.

Mr. Shepherd's Considerations. 59

acted like the Devil. You add, that he (z) was one of those unconverted persons, that have a secret antipathy against serious Godliness.

And as for my self (God help me) I am e'en as black as you can paint me. I am (a) one of the sottishly ignorant, or those whose malignity has wormed out or blasted their reason. I have (b) an antipathy to good manners, my mouth (c) needs washing, and my hands are (d) extremely dirty. I have (e) nothing of Humility and Meekness, have thrown off all humanity, and (f) throw dirt with one hand, and fire with the other. I have (g) an unusual assurance, (h) a most exalted pride; and once ('tis well indeed, it was no oftener) I chanced to lose all patience and modesty; and (by the way) I wish it had been your good fortune, Sir, to have found a small quantity of either of 'em. It seems also, that (i) I am a scoffing Clergy-man, (k) a profane Scholar, and one of the (l) fierce Atheists. Now if these Characters do not contain abundance of flame, bitterness, and provoking language; I am greatly mistaken.

And yet, notwithstanding this heap of Infamy, which you have most unjustly cast upon the Established Church in general, and upon Bishop Barlow and my self in particular; you (m) say, you are still in Humor, and that you scruple speaking evil of your Neighbor. What treatment then may we all expect, when your Worship is displeased, and shall vouchsafe to speak, what you think EVIL, of us?

(z) Pag. 49. (a) P. 22. (b) P. 69. (c) P. 85. (d) P. 51.
 (e) P. 81, 82. (f) P. 21. (g) P. 12. (h) P. 81, 87. (i) P. 91.
 (k) P. 80, 91. (l) P. 60. (m) P. 21.

As for me, had you but added a Cloven-foot, you had certainly given me *all* the Accoutrements of a complete *DEVIL*. But I consider, that your Tongue is no Slander; and therefore I shall not resent your having made (tho' not a *Devil*, yet) a finish'd *Monster* of me.

One thing more I cannot but take notice of. You have confidence enough to (n) say, that *Origen* and *Erasmus* were not in Holy Orders. Whereas this is so gross and palpable a Falshood, as (had I not been acquainted with your way of Writing) I should have thought it impossible for any Man to be guilty of.

I might proceed in my Remarks upon many other particulars; but that I have already written a longer Answer, than either I had designed, or your *Considerations* require. Besides, you have (o) assured me, that *he that reads* (Mr. *Lockyer's*, Mr. *Gouge's* and your own) *good Books on purpose to weed 'em, will insensibly slay himself with the stench*. 'Tis advisable therefore to desist from such Work, as will by your own confession *stink* a man to death.

I am

Your Servant,

THO. BENNET.

(n) Pag. 91. (o) P. 80.

2 NO 66

ADVERTISEMENT.

A Discourse of *Schism*, &c. The Second Edition.

A Defence of the Discourse of *Schism*, in Answer to Mr. *Shepherd's* Three Sermons of Separation, &c.

Both by the same Author.